ADJOURNMENT MOTION.

PRESIDENT: I have received notice of an adjournment motion from Mr. N. E. Varughese. The motion reads thus :—

> "I beg leave to make a motion for an adjournment of the business of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, *viz*, the famine conditions that have recently begun to prevail in the country resulting from all available sources of the people being exhausted in consequence of the economic depression, and necessitating the adoption of relief measures to enable unskilled labourers to find employment and make their living."

In the first place, this motion lacks the essential condition which would make it a motion for adjournment of the House, namely, there is no mention of any specific event of recent occurrence. The famine, the economic depression and the unemployment are all matters which have been of a continuing nature. Further, this question has been discussed threadbare on the floor of the House quite recently in the course of the same session. Therefore I think I will not only be violating a principle, but also deliberately wasting the time of the House if I admit this as an adjournment motion. I rule it out of order.

PRESIDENT'S RULING *re* BUDGET MOTIONS.

Having scrutinised the token and other motions so far received and watched also the trend of discussions in the House during the last few days, I consider it necessary to lay down the principles which should determine the admissibility of such motions and the range of discussion permissible under them.

The purpose of a token motion and the debate on a token motion must be strictly *relevant* to the purpose for which the amount sought to be reduced is demanded. If the motion relates to the total grant for a Department, the debate is allowed to range over the whole policy of the Department. If the total sought to be reduced is a sub-total, then the debate is allowed to range over only so much of the policy of the Department as may, by a rule of relevancy, be apportioned to that sub-total. If, for instance, the amount sought to be reduced is only the single item of travelling allowance, the debate must be strictly confined to the travelling of the officer for whose travelling the amount is demanded. If the amount sought to be reduced is the amount of salaries for clerks, the debate must be confined to the work of the clerks. If the amount sought to be reduced is the sub-total under, say, "Direction" in the Education grant, the debate must be confined to the policy involved in *Direction* and no further. If, however, the amount sought to be reduced is the grand total of, say, the Education Demand, the entire educational policy, even the policy for which the Government are responsible, is within the scope of the debate.

So far, it is a question of relevancy. There is, however, another rule. Even if the purpose of the motion and the debate of the motion

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly